

**REMARKS**

Favorable reconsideration of this application, as further amended, is respectfully requested.

Counsel wishes to thank the Examiner for the courtesies extended during the telephone interview held on November 9, 2010. The substance of the interview is incorporated into these remarks. Counsel also wishes to thank the Examiner for his willingness to consider a Supplemental Amendment to this application.

Independent Claims 31, 34 and 37 have been further amended to address alleged scope of enablement and indefiniteness issues discussed during the interview.

Without acceding to the outstanding rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), independent Claims 31, 34 and 37 have also been amended to set forth certain structural features of Applicants' invention with greater particularity. It is apparent that these claims, and their respective dependents, now distinguish patentably from Astle, the primary reference.

For example, amended Claim 31 now recites a filter module having a first filter stage and a second filter stage, the fluid quality sensor being disposed in a flow path between the first filter stage and the second filter stage. Claim 31 also recites that the controller is configured to read the filter module unique identifier and begin estimating a quantity of fluid pumped when the fluid quality sensor gives a second indication indicating that the first filter stage has failed and that the second filter stage will fail imminently and to control the pump to continue pumping until the estimated quantity of fluid pumped reaches a predetermined quantity, and to read the filter module unique identifier again once the predetermined quantity of fluid has been pumped and to control the pump to stop pumping when the unique identifier read after pumping the predetermined quantity of

fluid matches the unique identifier read when the fluid quality sensor first gave the second indication.

Astle, at the portions discussed during the interview (e.g., paragraphs 5, 6, 11-17), generally describes replaceable filter cartridges and preventing fluid flow through a filter once a cartridge set point has been exceeded. However, Astle fails to teach or suggest the above-mentioned features of Claim 31. In particular, Astle fails to teach or suggest controlling a pump to pump a predetermined quantity of fluid once a first filter stage has failed, as indicated by a fluid quality sensor giving a second indication. Further, Astle fails to teach or suggest controlling a pump to stop pumping if an identifier read from a filter module once the predetermined quantity of fluid has been pumped is the same as an identifier read when a fluid quality sensor first gives an indication that a first filter stage has failed, as set forth in Claim 31.

Accordingly, Claim 31 and its dependents distinguish patentably from Astle and should now be allowed.

Independent Claims 34 and 37, and their respective dependents, are allowable for reasons similar to those discussed above regarding Claim 31.

Applicants respectfully request an early Notice of Allowance.

Should the Examiner believe that any further action is necessary to place this application in better form for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicants' representative at the telephone number listed below.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge to Deposit Account No. 50-1165 (T4342-14498US01) any fees under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16 and 1.17 that may be required by this paper and to credit any overpayment to that Account. If any extension of time is required in connection with the filing of this paper and has not been separately requested, such extension is hereby requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: December 1, 2010

By: Stephen W. Aycock II/

Mark A. Catan

Reg. No. 38,720

Miles & Stockbridge, P.C.  
1751 Pinnacle Drive  
Suite 500  
McLean, Virginia 22102-3833  
(703) 903-9000

Stephen W. Aycock II

Reg. No. 52,579